Case 3:16-cv-01030-WHA Document 174 Filed 02/17/17 Page 1 of 3

The adversarial nature of the filings notwithstanding, the parties appear, for the most part, to be in agreement. Plaintiffs indeed "offer no reason why an extension is needed to file the amended pleading they have been given leave to file" [Dckt. # 172 at 2] because they seek no such extension. Should this court desire to proceed solely on the Plaintiffs' intentional misrepresentation and concealment claims via the second amended complaint, they will file the same on February 22. In that event, everyone is on notice that Carlos Rogers will be filing a complaint with whatever claims he may be able to bring in such time as he may be able to bring them. And that in such an event, those claims will likely be consolidated with the claims here, and such consolidation could impact the current deadlines in this case. But if however this court would prefer to have Mr. Rogers' claims included in that filing, Plaintiffs ask only that they have sufficient time to be able to prepare the same. A March 3 filing will press Plaintiffs' counsel, but they have committed to it, and will get it done, should the court so allow.

The parties diverge on three other issues. First, while true that the court has said that Plaintiffs cannot amend their RICO claims, [Dckt. # 172 at 2], it has not said, nor could it, that a potential plaintiff with ripe claims could not file a complaint against the defendants. Second, Plaintiffs agree that the court dismissed the conspiracy claims. [Dckt. # 172 at 2]. And they further acknowledge that an argument could be made that the same logic that applies to their state law conspiracy claims applies to their RICO conspiracy claims, though they do not concede the point. But as to Plaintiffs' RICO claims not grounded in conspiracy, the only basis for dismissal was statute of limitations. Third, Plaintiffs do not seek to skirt the deadline imposed to add new parties. [Dckt. # 172 at 2]. Rather, they simply ask that if the court desires to hear these claims from this new plaintiff as part of this new pleading, they be allowed sufficient time to plead the same and explain why they should be allowed to do so.

William N. Sinclair DATED: February 17, 2017 1 Steven D. Silverman Stephen G. Grygiel 2 Phillip J. Closius Alexander Williams SILVERMAN|THOMPSON|SLUTKIN|WHITE|LLC 3 4 /s/ William N. Sinclair 5 [ATTORNEY SIGNATURE] 201 N. Charles Street, Suite 2600 6 Baltimore, MD 21201 Telephone: (410) 385-2225 7 Facsimile: (410) 547-2432 8 Thomas J. Byrne Mel T. Owens NAMANNY BYRNE & OWENS, P.C. 9 2 South Pointe Drive, Suite 245 Lake Forest, CA 92630 10 Telephone: (949) 452-0700 Facsimile: (949) 452-0707 11 Stuart A. Davidson Mark J. Dearman 12 Janine D. Arno ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN 13 & DOWD LLP 120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 14 Boca Raton, FL 33432 Telephone: (561) 750-3000 Facsimile: (561) 750-3364 15 Rachel L. Jensen (SBN 211456) 16 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMÁN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 17 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 231-1058 18 Facsimile: (619) 231-7423 19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 20 21 22 23 24

25